

REMARKS

The final Office Action mailed on August 18, 2008, has been received, and carefully considered.

The rejection of claims 1, 3-5, and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed. It is submitted by the Applicant that the term "maximum possible contact", when taken in context with the description of the invention on page 14, lines 6-10, clearly and distinctly describes what the Applicant is claiming. The purpose of the present invention is to increase the loading possibilities for the ball bearing units (specification at page 14, lines 5-6). This is achieved by shaping each outer surface presented by the side-by-side loops to give the maximum possible contact between the ball and the wire (page 14, lines 6-7). In other words, so that maximum contact between the ball and the outer surface is achieved, the contact surface of each loop should more or less approach the spherical or cylindrical (page 14, lines 7-10).

It is submitted, therefore, that a person of ordinary skill in the art, in light of Applicant's specification disclosure, would understand the meaning of the term "maximum possible contact". It is to be further noted that the Patent Office has also used the term "maximum possible contact" on two occasions in setting forth the rejection of claims 1, 5,

and 8, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in view of the WO 00/31426 reference (page 3, lines 5-12, of the final Office action).

Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, and 8 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 00/31426. Claims 2-4 and 6-7 have also been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/31426.

The Applicant respectfully maintains that the cited prior art does not disclose or suggest Applicant's invention, as presently claimed. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

It is Applicant's position that the cited art does not disclose or suggest a ball bearing arrangement having the limitation *"the surface in a groove interacting with a rotatable unit being spherically shaped that up to maximum possible contact is obtained between the unit's outer surface and the corresponding outer surface of the groove"*.

Accordingly, the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest the limitations of the present claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a)

are unsustainable, and urges favorable reconsideration and withdrawal thereof.

It is believed that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early allowance to this effect is respectfully urged. If any final points remain that can be clarified by telephone, Examiner Charles is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Malcolm J. MacDonald". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with some capitalization.

Date: November 18, 2008

Malcolm J. MacDonald
Reg. No. 40,250
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 24